

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-40 were under consideration in the application, of which Claims 1, 15, 21, 24, 31, and 33 are independent. Claims 13-32 have been previously withdrawn from consideration. In the Office Action dated June 18, 2007, Claims 1-12 and 33-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-14, 33, and 35-40 remain under consideration in this application with Claim 34 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. In the Office Action, Claims 1, 13, and 14 were identified as linked to linking Groups II and IV; however, by virtue of dependency, Group I is also linked. Accordingly, Claims 1, 13, and 14 will be examined with the elected invention Group I. Applicant hereby addresses the Examiner's rejections in turn.

**I. Interview Summary**

Applicant thanks Examiner Nguyen for the courtesy of a telephone interview on October 5, 2007, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious the claims as currently amended. In addition, the Examiner suggested further amendments, which are incorporated, to further distinguish the claims from the cited references. Furthermore, the Examiner indicated the currently amended claims appear to overcome the cited references. However, a further search of the art is needed and no agreement was reached regarding patentability.

## II. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-12, and 33-40 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated June 18, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6-12, and 33-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0174392 ("*Bjoernsen*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,213,051 ("*Zhu*"). Claims 1 and 33 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "wherein the collaboration data comprises at least one task list identifying: at least one task to be performed, a subject matter of the at least one task, a priority of the at least one task, and a due date for completion of the task." Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 20, lines 4-23.

In contrast, *Bjoernsen* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Bjoernsen* merely discloses that a launch pad 240 can be displayed in any appropriate manner. (See paragraph [0079].) In *Bjoernsen*, launch pad 240 can be launched in a portal tool area (e.g., by clicking a link in a header area of the portal), and may be displayed as a view in the portal. (See paragraph [0079].) *Bjoernsen*'s launch pad 240 can also be launched as a single-user object or a selection of users, or a single object or collection of objects, and may be displayed as a simple object. (See paragraph [0079].) Accordingly, *Bjoernsen* merely discloses displaying a launch pad in various manners by clicking links within a portal. Consequently, *Bjoernsen* does not disclose i) a task list identifying a task to be performed, ii) a subject matter of the task, iii) a priority of the task, or iv) a due date for completion of the task.

Rather *Bjoernsen* merely discloses displaying launch pads and is silent regarding task list identifying elements of tasks in the task list.

In addition, *Zhu* does not overcome *Bjoernsen*'s deficiencies. *Zhu* merely discloses recording an on-line meeting (also referred to as an "on-line conference") and saving the recording as a meeting recording file. (See Abstract.) In *Zhu*, the saved meeting recording file may be played back and/or edited. (See Abstract.) Moreover, in *Zhu*, a user may open a meeting recording file during an on-line meeting, and all on-line meeting attendees can see, as well as hear, the recording content. (See Abstract.) Accordingly, *Zhu* merely discloses an on-line meeting being recorded such that all attendees can see and hear the recording. Consequently, *Zhu* does not disclose i) a task list identifying a task to be performed, ii) a subject matter of the task, iii) a priority of the task, or iv) a due date for completion of the task. Rather *Zhu* merely discloses recording an on-line meeting and is silent regarding a task list identifying elements of tasks in the task list.

Combining *Bjoernsen* with *Zhu* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Bjoernsen* and *Zhu*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "wherein the collaboration data comprises at least one task list identifying: at least one task to be performed, a subject matter of the at least one task, a priority of the at least one task, at least one member that the at least one task has been assigned to, and a due date for completion of the task," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 33 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 33 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 33.

Furthermore, regarding Claims 34, 36, 39, and 40 the Examiner states that *Bjoernsen* as modified by *Zhu* does not disclose a second UI object, when selected, causes objects to be displayed. (See Office Action page 7, lines 20-23 and page 8, lines 16-19.) To overcome *Bjoernsen's* and *Zhu's* deficiencies the Examiner relies on Official Notice.

As a result, Applicants respectfully suggest that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In order to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must set forth prior art which teach or suggest every claim limitation. (See MPEP § 2143.) If the Examiner continues to rely on this unsupported contention, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide support. See, In re Zurko, 258 F.3d 1379, 59 U.S.P.Q.2d 1693 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (holding that the USPTO must point to some concrete evidence in the record to support core factual findings in a determination of patentability); Memorandum by Stephen G. Kunin, Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy (February 21, 2002)(stating that it is never appropriate to rely on common knowledge without evidentiary support as sole or principal evidence on which to base rejection); 37 C.F.R. § 1.104 (providing that when a rejection in an application is based on facts within the personal knowledge of an Examiner, the data should be stated as specifically as possible, *and the facts must be supported*, when called for by the applicant, by an affidavit from the Examiner); MPEP § 2144.03 (providing that the Examiner may only take official notice of facts outside of the record which are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being "well-known" in the art and, if the Applicant traverses such an assertion, the Examiner *should cite a reference* in support of his or her position.).

Dependent Claims 2-12 and 35-40 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 33, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 33. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-12 and 35-40.

### III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: November 16, 2007

---

D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

